

OPINION 1300

TEIIDAE GRAY, 1827 GIVEN NOMENCLATURAL PRECEDENCE
OVER AMEIVIDAE FITZINGER, 1826 (REPTILIA, SAURIA)

RULING. — (1) Under the plenary powers it is hereby ruled that the family-group name TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) is to be given nomenclatural precedence over the family-group name AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Teius* Merrem, 1820 (gender: masculine), type species, by subsequent designation by Burt & Burt, 1933, *Teius viridis* Merrem, 1820 (Name Number 2239);
- (b) *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 (gender: masculine), type species, by absolute tautonymy through *Temapara tupinambis* Ray, 1693, *Tupinambis monitor* Daudin, 1802 (Name Number 2240);
- (c) *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795 (gender: feminine) type species, by monotypy, *Ameiva americana* Meyer, 1795 (Name Number 2241).

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *teyou* Daudin, 1802, as published in the binomen *Lacerta teyou* (specific name of type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820) (Name Number 2933);
- (b) *teguixin* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta teguixin* (the valid specific name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802 (Name Number 2934);
- (c) *ameiva* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binomen *Lacerta ameiva* (the valid specific name at the time of this ruling for the type species of *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795 (Name Number 2935).

(4) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) with an endorsement that it is to be given nomenclatural precedence over AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon (Name Number 566);
- (b) AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type genus *Ameiva* Meyer, 1795) with an endorsement that it is not to be given priority over TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 (type genus *Teius* Merrem, 1820) whenever the two names are applied to the same taxon (Name Number 567).

(5) The unavailable family-group name TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825 is hereby placed on the Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 502.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1920

An application for the conservation of the family-group name TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 was first received from Dr William Presch (now of *California State University, Fullerton, California*) on 20 February 1970. In the circumstances of the time it was overlooked. In February 1980 a revised draft was prepared by the Secretariat and sent to Dr Presch for examination. His amended draft was sent to the printer on 12 August 1980 and published on 30 July 1981 in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 38, pp. 194–195. Public notice of the possible use of the plenary powers in the case was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* as well as to the statutory serials, to seven general serials and three herpetological serials.

In a comment published on 30 September 1982 in vol. 39, pp. 157–158, Professor H. M. Smith, Mrs R. B. Smith and Dr David Chiszar showed that TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825 was in fact an unavailable name and therefore did not threaten the stability of TEIIDAE Gray, 1827 as Dr Presch had thought. On the other hand, they did show that the stability of TEIIDAE was threatened by AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 and accordingly asked that TEIIDAE be given nomenclatural precedence over that name. Dr Presch fully accepted this comment.

In a further comment published on 30 December 1983 in vol. 40, pp. 196–197, Mr Andrew Stimson corrected certain factual errors concerning the respective type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 and *Tupinambis* Daudin, 1802. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 June 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-Month Rule on Voting Paper (1984)25 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 157–158, taking into account the corrections of fact published in vol. 40, pp. 196–197. At the close of the voting period on 13 September 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — sixteen (16) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Mroczkowski, Cocks, Schuster, Savage, Binder, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Hahn, Kraus, Brinck, Corliss, Heppell

Negative Votes — one (1): Dupuis.

Alvarado, Bayer, Bernardi, Halvorsen and Ride were on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Cogger, Lehtinen and Willink.

On 13 July 1984 Monsieur Dupuis wrote to the Secretary in the following terms: 'Je suis dans l'obligation morale, et sans doute juridique, de vous demander de suspendre le vote relatif à la conservation de TEIIDAE.'

'Le dernier commentaire publié relatif à ce cas se trouve dans *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 40(4) paru le 30 décembre 1983 et j'estime qu'ouvrir le vote le 13 juin 1984 ne respecte pas l'esprit de la règle des six mois.'

'De plus, Lescure et Cei ont soumis à la Commission une proposition — malheureusement encore inédite — pour la conservation de *Ameiva oculata* d'Orbigny & Bibron, 1837, qui, selon ces mêmes auteurs, est le seul nom valide pour *Teius teyou* des auteurs, non Daudin. Dans ce même manuscrit Lescure & Cei estiment nécessaire de désigner un néotype pour *Lacerta teyou* Daudin. Or, la proposition du Dr Presch suggérant de placer *Teius teyou* (Daudin) sur la Liste Officielle, il vaudrait mieux que ce nom y soit défini sans ambiguïté. A mon avis il serait plus sage d'attendre les commentaires définitifs de nos collègues — et en particulier la publication de leur requête précitée — que de voter dans la précipitation. Si vous ne suivez pas mon point de vue, je vous demande de considérer que je vote contre la proposition du Dr Presch.'

On receipt of Monsieur Dupuis' comment I consulted Mr Andrew Stimson (*British Museum (Natural History) London*). He was inclined to agree with Monsieur Dupuis, but pointed out (a) that the nominal type species of *Teius* Merrem, 1820 must be *Lacerta teyou* Daudin, irrespective of the biological species involved; (b) that that is the only originally included nominal species remaining in the genus; (c) that the two biological species remaining in the genus were for long considered conspecific, so that it is unlikely they will ever be placed in different genera. Having regard to the length of time that had elapsed since the first receipt of Dr Presch's application, therefore, I judged it best to publish the decision of the Commission reached in the present case. In reply to Monsieur Dupuis I pointed out that the six months' rule applied only to cases involving the use of the plenary powers. The most recent comment mentioned by him did not involve any unadvertised use of those powers, so that the six months' rule was not relevant. I also pointed out that the publication of the application by MM. Lescure and Cei depended upon my receiving answers to questions that are still open.

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references to the names placed on Official Lists and an Official Index by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Ameiva* Meyer, 1795, *Syn. Rept.* (Göttingen), p. 31
ameiva, *Lacerta*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 202
AMEIVIDAE Fitzinger, 1826, *Neue Class. Rept.*, p. 21
teguixin, *Lacerta*, Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* ed. 10, vol. 1, p. 208

TEIIDAE Gray, 1827, *Phil. Mag.* (2) vol. 1, p. 53

Teius Merrem, 1820, *Tent. Syst. Amph.*, pp. 13, 60

teyou, *Lacerta*, Daudin, 1802, Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist. nat. Rept.*, vol. 3, p. 195

TUPINAMBIDAE Gray, 1825, *Ann. Philos.* vol. 26 (N.S. vol. 10), p. 199

Tupinambis Daudin, 1802, Sonnini's Buffon, *Hist. nat. Rept.*, vol. 3, p. 5.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on V.P.(84)25 were cast as set out above, that the proposal contained in that voting paper has been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1300.

R. V. MELVILLE

Secretary

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

London

18 October 1984